REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final rejection mailed 09/08/2006, claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 14, 20, 21, 23, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman et al. U.S. Patent 6,539,421 (hereinafter Appelman) in view of Morris et al. U.S. Patent 6,496,851 (hereinafter Morris). Claims 2-3, 5-9, 12-13, 15-19, 22, 24-30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Kapil et al. U.S. Patent 6,941,234 (hereinafter Kapil) in view of Morris et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In division 3, the examiner admits that Appelman fails to teach unidentified client, and the second client being unknown to the first client and being unaddressed by the first client. In division 4, the examiner admits that Appelman and Kapil fail to teach subscribing and being authenticated and authorized by said publish/subscribe server unknown to others of said second or first clients. It is submitted that Morris also does not teach or suggest having subscribing users who are unknown to the first user. In Fig. 2 of Morris and Col. 2, lines 9 and 10, the chat room 200 participants' identities or screen names are listed in a scrolling window 210. Thus, when a user enters a chat room, the identities or screen names of the participants in the chat room are shown in window 210, wherein the other participants are known to the user. As discussed in Morris, in the chat room, participants are provided a list of users and text entered by any participant is displayed in the scrolling text window 202 of each participant (see Col. 2, lines 4-9). In Morris Fig. 2, the caption above 210 is, "People Here: 22."

In independent claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, 25, and 29, the claimed second client is unidentified and is unknown to the first client. It is submitted that the chat room of Morris does not teach or suggest a second client who is unidentified and unknown to the first client. In Morris, a first user enters a chat room and is immediately provided awareness of a list of users in the chat room (Fig. 2, scrolling window 210). In Morris, the chat room 200 has 22 participants whose identities or screen names are listed in a scrolling window 210 (Col. 2, lines 7-9). Thus, in Morris the user is able to see identifiers or screen names of users in the chat. Furthermore, a first user entering the chat room also knows the number of other users in the room. In the present invention, the user requesting that a message be broadcast to the group does not know which identifiers or how many subscribers they will reach. At the time of the broadcast and even after the broadcast, the user of our invention does not have any awareness to how many people the message reached. The first user is unaware of the potential users or number of users their message may reach, but the recipients, if any, of said message are aware of the first user and may respond, if desired.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 14, 20, 21, 23, 31, and 33 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Appelman in view of Morris, which allowance is respectfully requested. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 2-3, 5-9, 12-13, 15-19, 22, 24-30, and 32 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Appelman in view of Kapil in view of Morris, which allowance is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/Floyd A. Gonzalez/

FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney

Registration No. 26,732

Phone: 845-433-7282

Fax: 845-432-9786